



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

### CORRIGENDA AND ADDENDA TO W. D. WALLIS' "INDO-GERMANIC RELATIONSHIP TERMS AS HISTORICAL EVIDENCE"

DR. WALLIS is deserving of the thanks of all anthropologists and Americanists who have at the same time a certain familiarity with Indo-Germanic studies for calling attention<sup>1</sup> to the usefulness for wider studies in kinship terminology of the Indo-Germanic kinship data. It is true, as he remarks, that these data, readily accessible in the works of Delbrück, Schrader, Hirt, Feist, and others, have not yet been utilized as much as they deserve.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately Dr. Wallis has, perhaps through no fault of his own, allowed a regrettably large number of inaccuracies, some relatively trivial, others not so trivial, to slip into his paper. In this note I do not propose to give an independent discussion of Indo-Germanic kinship terms or to treat of the relation of these terms to sociological factors. I shall confine myself to correcting, so far as I am able, these inaccuracies of Dr. Wallis's, in order that his facts may be fruitfully handled by those interested in the subject. A few supplementary data here and there will probably be welcome. I shall use the opportunity to correct a large number of misprints, some of which are highly misleading.

P. 420, ll. 32, 33: For "*propatrius*" and "*abpatrius*" read "*propatrius*" and "*abpatruus*" respectively. These terms are directly derived from *patruus* "paternal uncle." For "*abavunculus*" read "*abavunculus*."

P. 420, ll. 32, 33 and p. 421, ll. 3, 4: Synonymous with *propatrius* "great-grandfather's brother" and *proavunculus* "greatgrandmother's brother" are *patruus mājor*, "greater paternal uncle," and *avunculus mājor*, "greater maternal uncle," respectively. Synonymous with *abpatruus*, "great-great-grandfather's brother," and *abavunculus*, "great-great-grandmother's brother," are *patruus māximus* "greatest paternal uncle" and *avunculus māximus* "greatest maternal uncle" respectively. Similarly, synonymous with *proamita*, *promātertera*, *abamita*, and *abmā-*

<sup>1</sup> *American Anthropologist*, N. S., vol. 20, 1918, pp. 419-431.

<sup>2</sup> A few Indo-Germanic parallels are quoted by T. Michelson, Remarks on Terms of Relationship, *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences*, vol. VII, 1917, pp. 181-184. He also calls attention to Delbrück's work.

*tertera* are *amita mājor*, “greater paternal aunt,” *māterterta mājor*, “greater maternal aunt,” *amita māxima*, “greatest paternal aunt,” and *māterterta māxima*, “greatest maternal aunt.” These terms logically continue *patruus māgnus*, “great paternal uncle,” *avunculus māgnus*, “great maternal uncle,” *amita māgna*, “great paternal aunt,” and *māterterta māgna*, “great maternal aunt.” Our own *great-uncle* and *great-aunt* are directly modeled on *avunculus māgnus* and *amita māgna* respectively.

P. 421, l. 6: The descriptive Latin terms for “niece” should have been given as well as those for “nephew,” *i. e.*, *frātris filia* and *sorōris filia*. *Nepōs* and *Neptis* generally mean “grandson” and “granddaughter,” as Wallis notes (p. 420), but their later Latin use for “nephew” and “niece” should have been entered here not only because this usage eventually became predominant (cf. French *neveu* and *nièce*) but also because Indo-Germanic \**nepōt-s* and \**nepti-s* throughout show a strong tendency to pass from “grandchild, descendant” to “nephew” and “niece.” Thus, in Germanic, Anglo-Saxon *nefa* means both “grandchild” and “nephew”; Old High German *nēvo* and Middle High German *nēve* mean primarily “sister’s son,” less often “brother’s son”; while Old Norse *nipt*, Old High German *nift*, and Middle High German *niftel* all regularly denote “sister’s daughter” or, more inclusively, “niece.” Further, Old Church Slavic *netiji* and *nestera* denote “nephew” and “niece” respectively; Irish *niæ* (gen. *niath*) and *necht* denote “sister’s son” and “niece”; while Albanian *mbese* (from \**nepōtiā*) refers to both “granddaughter” and “niece.” Under these circumstances it seems far more likely that the Indo-Germanic terms were inclusively used for “grandchild” and “nephew, niece” (or perhaps “sister’s child”), however this classification be explained, than that several independent transfers from “grandchild” to “sibling’s child” took place. The supposedly late Latin use of *nepōs* and *neptis* for “nephew” and “niece” is quite likely to hide an antique folk usage. There is much that is ancient in folk Latin and Romance that, for some reason or other, never or only sporadically found its way into standardized literary Latin.

P. 421, l. 7: Wallis’ terms for “cousins” (*frātrēs patruēlēs*, *frātrēs consobrīnī*, and *frātrēs amitīnī*) apply only to male cousins. The corresponding terms for female cousins (*sorōrēs patruēlēs*, *sorōrēs consobrīnāe*, and *sorōrēs amitīnāe*) should have been noted, also the fact that the descriptive elements of these terms were also used alone (*patruēlēs*; *consobrīnī*, *consobrīnāe*; *amitīnī*, *amitīnāe*). From *consobrinus*, *consobrina*, originally “cousin through father’s brother or mother’s sister,” later extended to cover all cousins, are derived French *cousin*, *cousine*

and our own *cousin*. Parallel to *patruēlis*, and apparently synonymous with *amitinus*, was also *mātruēlis* "mother's brother's son."

P. 421, l. 9: There is no such term as "consororini." *Consobrīnī* goes back to an older \**consosr-īnī* < \*-swesr- (Indo-Germanic *swe-* regularly develops to Latin *so-*; -*sr-* to -*br-*); *soror* "sister" is developed from \**swesōr*. Hence *con-sobr-īnus* literally means "having sisters in common (as mothers)."

P. 421, l. 12: Wallis states that "the children of cousins german, that is, those whose fathers are brothers or whose mothers are sisters, call each other *sobrinus* [misprint for *sobrinus*] or *sobrina*." This is somewhat ambiguous, but it seems to refer to children of *patruēlēs* or *consobrīnī*. The terms *sobrinus*, *sobrina*, however, indicate, according to Riddle, "a cousin-german by the mother's side," in other words they are synonymous with *consobrinus*, *consobrina*.

P. 421, l. 15: I can make nothing of *proprior sobrino*, defined by Wallis as "cousin german of my father or of my mother." Is this *prior sobrinus* "an earlier cousin german" or *propior sobrīnō* "nearer to the *sobrinus*" (hence possibly "related to the *sobrinus*")?

P. 421, l. 19: *Janitrices* should have been translated as a plural, "wives of brothers." Like its Indo-Germanic cognates (Sanskrit *yātaras*, Homeric Greek *eīvarépes*), it is used chiefly in the plural.

P. 421, l. 20: "Enater, husband of deceased sister," is an amazing entry. I have looked high and low for it and can find no trace of it. It would be decidedly interesting to Americanists to establish the presence in Indo-Germanic of a special term for a kin by affinity after the decease of the connecting link. Perhaps the following entry in Liddell and Scott's "Greek-English Lexicon" helps to clear up the mystery: "*eīvarépes, brothers' wives . . .* The corresponding masc. [*i. e.*, "sisters' husbands"] is *ἀέλιοι*; but in an Epitaph. ap. Orell. Inscr. Lat. 2, p. 421, *ἡνατέρ, δ, is the husband of the deceased's sister.*" It may be that Wallis has misunderstood this very entry. The Greek *ἡνατέρ* is not, as he seems to have assumed, a Greek orthography for a supposed Latin "*enater*," but is simply an inscriptional form of the Greek *eīvarήρ*, *ἐνατήρ*. The Latin *Inscriptiones* (*orelli*) are not accessible to me, hence I cannot explain why a Greek term was introduced into a Latin inscriptional text. Very likely the inscription occurs in what was then still a Greek-speaking part of southern Italy (Magna Graecia) and the man responsible for setting it up, having no Latin term at hand for *eīvarήρ*, apparently confused with *ἀέλιος*, introduced the Greek term that was familiar to him. Evidently this *ἡνατέρ* meant to him "husband of wife's

sister," not "husband of a deceased sister." The "deceased" has no point other than that Liddell and Scott, quoting from an epitaph, so refer to the dead wife. The Latin "*enater*, husband of deceased sister" would thus seem to be a phantom twice over.

P. 421, l. 21: Wallis states that he "has not been able to discover any terms for such relationships (brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law) on the side of the wife." In the main it is true that, in Indo-Germanic, terms of this sort on the side of the husband are better developed than corresponding terms through the wife. Latin *lēvir* "husband's brother," *glōs* "husband's sister," and *janitrīcēs* "husband's brother's wife and reciprocal" have Indo-Germanic cognates, but "wife's brother" and "wife's sister" have, apparently, no primary Latin or Indo-Germanic designations. Latin *frātria* "brother's wife" is a secondary Latin development from *frāter* and means no more than "she who belongs to the brother." Wallis might have noted, however, that *lēvir* is also used in Latin, though probably only secondarily, for "wife's brother." "Sister's husband" is either descriptively rendered as *sorōris maritus* or, doubtfully, as *frāter* "brother." I can find nothing for "wife's sister."

Two very important Latin terms of affinity are omitted, no doubt inadvertently. These are *gener* "son-in-law" (whence French *gendre*) and *socrus* "mother-in-law." Both of these have great antiquity, as they have Indo-Germanic cognates.

P. 422, l. 1: Wallis speaks of Greek kinship terms as being "the parents of the Latin terms, which have, in most instances, been derived from the Greek." This is a surprising statement from one that is well enough informed to speak of "Indo-Germanic" at all. As a matter of fact, there is not one single Latin kinship term that is derived from the Greek. The undoubtedly resemblances between the Latin and the Greek terms are, of course, due to independent development from a common Indo-Germanic source.

P. 422, l. 4: *θέλος* is not "mother's brother" but "uncle," whether paternal or maternal. The maternal correlate of *πάτρως* "father's brother" is not *θέλος*, but *μήτρως* "mother's brother." This is recognized by Wallis himself further on. As feminine counterpart of *θέλος* should have been given *θεία* "aunt" (paternal or maternal).

P. 422, l. 5: Wallis speaks of "*πατροκασίγνητος* (correct to *πατροκασίγνητος*), the son of father's brother." I cannot find this meaning given by Liddell and Scott. *πατροκασίγνητος*, literally "father-brother," primarily denotes "paternal uncle." Inasmuch, however, as *κασίγνητος* and *κασιγήτη* are used in Homeric Greek not only for "brother" and

"sister" but also for "sibling's child; nephew, niece," it is possible that *πατροκασίγνητος* might have been correlatively used also for "male cousin through one's father, father's sibling's son." In any event it is hard to believe that it was confined to "father's brother's son," as it is linguistically unavoidable to have it refer, in its secondary meaning, to *πατροκασγνήτη* "father's sister" no less than to *πατροκασίγνητος* "father's brother."

P. 422, l. 8: *δελφός* is not "womb," which is *δελφις*. Wallis has incorrectly abstracted a *δελφός* from derivatives in -*δελφός*. In discussing the terms *ἀδελφός* "brother" and *ἀδελφή* "sister," Wallis speaks of "the maternal relationship being connoted in the stem . . . , meaning 'womb.'" His point seems to be that in these terms we have evidence of a maternal method of reckoning descent. I believe this inference to be quite unwarranted. Full brothers are *ἀδελφός* "(begotten) of the same womb" whether the method of reckoning descent is maternal or paternal. The term *ἀδελφός* only secondarily means "brother"; as shown by its Sanskrit cognate *sagárbha-* (Indo-Germanic \**sm̥-g wélbhō-* "from the same womb"), it is a purely descriptive term intended to emphasize the idea, where necessary, of physiological kin. It no more refers to a method of reckoning descent than such an English term as *co-filial* or the Greek *δμοπάτριος* "born of the same father" and *δμομήτριος* "born of the same mother" (see p. 423 of Wallis' article).

P. 422, l. 10: Wallis states that "the terms for nephew and niece [*ἀδελφίδεος* and *ἀδελφιδῆ*] preserve the common connotation of relationship through the same female ancestor." These terms are merely derivatives of *ἀδελφός*, -*ή*, "brother, sister" and do not in the least involve a reference to the primary etymological sense of *ἀδελφός* "from the same womb." That primary sense did not, as we have seen, imply matrilineal reckoning, but even if it did, it could not follow that the patronymic<sup>1</sup> derivatives in -*ιέος*, -*ιή* implied or confirmed it. A *Netherlander* is not one who lives in a low or "nether" land but one who lives in *The Netherlands*, in which, of course, there is a reference to the etymological sense of *nether*.

P. 422, l. 12: Wallis states that "in the word *πασίγνητος* [correct to *κασίγνητος*], meaning a brother by the same mother (from *ἀγάστωρ*, from the (same) womb, we find the emphasis placed on relationship through the female line." This is quite incorrect. *κασίγνητος* is a compound of *κάσις* "brother, sister" and -*γνητος* "born, begotten of" (cf. Latin -*gnātus*). *ἀγάστωρ* is a derivative of *γαστήρ* "belly, womb," *ἀ-* being a

<sup>1</sup> I am using this word in its linguistic sense.

copulative prefix; ἀγάστωρ is synonymous with ἀδελφός in its etymological sense, hence "from the same womb; near kinsman." Neither element of ἀγάστωρ has anything to do with either element of καστίγνητος. Moreover, even if these words could conceivably be shown to be related, Wallis's reasoning would still be faulty, for the fact behind such words as ἀδελφός and ἀγάστωρ is a physiological, not a sociological one.

P. 422, l. 14: "This [καστίγνητος, ἀγάστωρ] became the *agnatio* of Latin, which there meant, not maternal but paternal relationship, suggesting a change in the method of reckoning descent, though there seems to be no historical evidence on the point." It is difficult to see how a Greek word, not borrowed by Latin, could "become" a Latin word. ἀγάστωρ, which is supposed by Wallis to point to matrilineal reckoning, is in no way connected with *agnatiō*, an abstract noun from *agnātus*, itself compounded of *ad-* "to" and *-gnātus* "born." The primary meaning of *agnātus* is thus "born to; kin to (one's primary, paternal, lineage)," as opposed to *cognātus* "born with; secondary, maternal, kin." *-gnātus*, as already pointed out, is cognate with Greek *-γνητος*, but this is here of no significance whatever. Wallis's efforts to prove a former matrilineal reckoning on the evidence of etymology are all futile.

P. 422, ll. 21, 22: Correct πατρωμήτωρ and πατρωπάτωρ to πατρομήτωρ and πατροπάτωρ, respectively.

P. 422, l. 26: Synonymous with πατροκασιγνήτη, "father's sister," is πατραδέλφη.

P. 422, l. 27: Synonymous with μητροκασιγνήτη, "mother's sister," is μητραδέλφη, also μητραδέλφος (fem.).

P. 422, l. 30: Correct μητραδέλφeos to μητραδέλφeos.

P. 423, l. 1: There is no Greek adjective πάτρικος. Perhaps πάτριος was meant.

P. 423, l. 2: "Our 'patrimony'" is not directly connected with πάτρικος or πάτριος. It is, of course, borrowed from Latin *patrimoniū*, which primarily meant "an estate bequeathed by a father to his children." The wider application of the term in English is not in the least bound up with the wider connotation ("hereditary") of the Greek words.

P. 423, l. 6: In defining νύός Wallis should have made it clearer that the primary meaning is "daughter-in-law" as proven by comparison with Indo-Germanic cognates, and that the other meanings ("bride; wife; any female related by marriage") are secondary.

P. 423, l. 7: ἐκνρός is defined as "step-father; father-in-law." It would have been useful to point out that its primary meaning is "father-in-law," originally "man's father-in-law," as abundantly proven by reference to Indo-Germanic cognates.

P. 423, l. 8: *πενθερός* is defined as "father-in-law" and, secondarily, other male relatives by affinity. It would have been useful to point out that, in contrast to *έκυρός*, it originally meant only "woman's father-in-law."

P. 423, l. 12: Analogously to *πενθερός*, *πενθερά* originally meant only "woman's mother-in-law." Wallis states that *πενθερά* is "derived from *πενθέω*, to lament, to bewail." This etymology must be summarily dismissed. *πενθερός* and *πενθερά* are derivatives from Indo-Germanic \**bhendh-* "to join" (whence our *bind*); compare also Sanskrit *bándhu-* "relative of the wife," Lithuanian *beñdras* "companion."

P. 423, l. 19: *έκυρα* should be corrected to *έκυρά*. It originally meant not "mother-in-law" but "man's mother-in-law." Analogously *έκυρός*, *έκυρά* also indicated "step-mother."

P. 423, l. 13: Correct *εινάτερες* and *εινάς* to *εινατέρες* and *εινάς*. There is no warrant for Wallis's statement that *εινατέρες* "wives of brothers" "seems to be derived from *εινάς*, ninth day." *εινατέρες* has, of course, well known Indo-Germanic cognates: Latin *janitricēs*, Sanskrit *yātaras*, Old Church Slavic *jetry*, Lettish *jentere*, Lithuanian *intę*. Greek *εἰν-* (or *ἐν-*) of *εινατέρες* (or *ένατέρες*) goes back to Indo-Germanic \**yen-*, while *εἰν-* of *εινάς* goes back to Indo-Germanic \**enw-*.

P. 423, l. 20: In defining *γαμβρός*, it would have been well to point out more clearly that its primary meaning is "son-in-law." In spite of some phonological difficulties there can be no reasonable doubt that it is cognate to certain other Indo-Germanic terms for "son-in-law": Latin *gener*, Sanskrit *jāmātar-*, Albanian *ðqander*, Old Church Slavic *zěti*, Lithuanian *žentas*.

P. 423, l. 23: As feminine counterpart of *ἀνεψιός* should have been listed also *ἀνεψιά* "female cousin; niece." Wallis' statement that "from this (?) is formed *νέποδις* [correct to *νέποδες*], 'descendants'" is misleading. Both *ἀνεψιός* and *νέποδες* (not properly a kinship term at all, but a rather obscure Homeric term plausibly translated as "brood"; -*ποδ-* for older \*-*pot-* because of folk-etymological confusion with *ποδ-* "foot") are to be derived from Indo-Germanic \**nepot-*, \**nept-* "grandchild, descendant; nephew, niece." *ἀνεψιός* is a derivative, originally \**a-nept-ijsós*, with copulative *a-*; it is *νέποδες*, despite its generalized and obscured meaning, which is nearer the original Indo-Germanic form. Sanskrit *napot* should be corrected to *napāt-*.

P. 423, l. 25: *μητριά* is not translated by Wallis. It means "step-mother." Its corresponding masculine *μητριός* "stepfather" is synonymous with *πατριός*.

P. 423, l. 27: Correct *παῖς* to *παῖς*.

P. 423, l. 33: It is difficult to see what relevancy there is in *θηλύπαις*, which is merely a descriptive compound ("female-childed, possessing a female child, having given birth to a female child"), quite without interest in a set of kinship terms. There are, of course, no end of such compounds in Greek, e. g., *ἀρρενογόνος* "begetting male children," *ἀρρενόπαις* "having a boy," *ἀρρενοτόκος* "bearing male children," *ἄπαις* "child-ess."

P. 423, l. 34: Correct *μητρυνυμικός* and *κατρυνυμικός* to *μητρωνυμικός* and *πατρωνυμικός* respectively.

There is one Greek kinship term that, obscure as it is, might have been included by Wallis with advantage because of its historical affiliations. This is *ἴωρ* or *ἴωρ*, plural *ἴωρες*, developed, with perfect regularity, from Indo-Germanic *sweisores* "sisters." The term does not occur in Greek literature but only as glosses in Hesychius. I quote from O. Schrader:<sup>1</sup> "The Indo-Germanic word for sister has disappeared in Greek except for one trace, which is preserved in the Hesychian [glosses] *ἴωρ* (*ἴωρ*)<sup>2</sup> θυγάτηρ, ἀνεψιός and *ἴωρες*<sup>3</sup> προσήκοντες, συγγενεῖς. Just as Homeric *κασίγνητος* indicated both the brother and the children of the brother, so *ἴωρες* may originally have signified "sisters," then "children of sisters, children of siblings" (*ἀνεψιοί*). Cf. Latin *consobrini* from \*con-sosr-ini : *soror*. These are probably meant by the *προσήκοντες*, *συγγενεῖς*. *θυγάτηρ*,<sup>3</sup> however, is probably an error for *ἀδελφή*, the ordinary term for sister in Greek." It is difficult to see, however, why Hesychius should have said "daughter" when he meant "sister." Is it not barely possible that by the gloss "*ἴωρ* θυγάτηρ, ἀνεψιός" Hesychius meant that daughter and nephew call each other *ἴωρ* (cousin of opposite sex)?

I do not understand why Wallis has omitted from his set of Greek kinship terms:

*πατήρ*, "father,"  
*μήτηρ*, "mother,"  
*νιός*, *νύσ*, "son,"  
*θυγάτηρ*, "daughter,"

particularly as each of these has such widespread Indo-Germanic cognates.

P. 424, l. 24: Wallis, referring to Herodotus' testimony as to matrilineal reckoning among the Lycians, calls these "near kin to the Greeks"

<sup>1</sup> *Reallexikon der Indogermanischen Altertumskunde*, 1901, s. v. *Schwester*.

<sup>2</sup> These words mean "relatives, kinsmen."

<sup>3</sup> I.e., "daughter."

(or does this phraseology go back to Herodotus?). No theory of the former existence of matrilineal reckoning among the Greeks can derive support from its presence among the Lycians and related peoples of Asia Minor. The Lycians were not only not "near kin to the Greeks," they were not even an Indo-Germanic people. This is clearly established by their numerous inscriptions, which, though easily read, are practically unintelligible. See Hirt, *Die Indogermanen*. Aside from the Greek (mostly Ionian) colonies of the western coast, the only clearly Indo-Germanic people of Asia Minor in Hellenic times were the Phrygians, whose scanty linguistic remains show them, apparently, to have been rather closely connected with the Thracians.

P. 426, l. 11: It is misleading to imply, as Wallis does, that *Vetter* is nowadays commonly used for "uncle." It is still used in that sense dialectically (e. g., in Judeo-German), but in standard German it now means "male cousin."

P. 426, l. 12: *Oheim*, needless to say, is not derived from *avunculus*, with which it is merely cognate, and that not very directly.

P. 426, l. 16: "Oheim seems related to the Frisian *ehm*, meaning mother's brother, and both of these to the Gothic *Awo*, 'grandmother.'" Wallis's facts are stated a bit clumsily. "Mother's brother" is \**aumā-* or \**auhaima-* in West Germanic: Old High German *ðheim*, Anglo-Saxon *eām* (whence, if I am not mistaken, our English proper names *Eames*, *Ames*), Old Frisian *ēm*, Dutch *oom*. This set of words is a derivative in *-ma-* or *-aima-* of an Indo-Germanic stem \**awō-*, \**awi-* "mother's brother": Old Cornish *eui-ter*, Middle Welsh *ewi-thr* (also "father's brother"), Lithuanian *awý-nas*, Old Prussian *awi-s*, Old Church Slavic *uži*, Latin *avu-nculus* (diminutive of *avu-s*, cf. *homunculus* from *homō*). Indo-Germanic \**awō-*, however, primarily means "grandfather": Armenian *hav*, Latin *avus*, German (dialectic) *awa*, also Old Norse *áe* "great-grandfather." It is true that Gothic *awō* means "grandmother," but *awō* is merely a feminine correlate to an \**awa* "grandfather" (cognate to Old Norse *áe*) that does not happen to occur in our very scanty Gothic remains. Nowhere is negative evidence so dangerous as in dealing with Gothic. Wallis's reference to Gothic *awō* seems to be actuated by a desire to emphasize an earlier matrilineal reckoning. He is as unfortunate here in using the linguistic evidence as in Greek.

P. 426, l. 18: Correct *Aidem* to *Eidam*; *ei* should be *eid*. I do not see how the relation of *Eidam* "son-in-law" to *Eid* "oath" (this etymology seems fairly well established) bears on matrilineal reckoning. The circle of ideas touched upon is probably bridal purchase, certainly

not descent. Nor do I see what sociological fruit is to be gathered from the purely descriptive term *Tochterman* (read *Tochtermann*) "daughter's husband."

P. 426, l. 21: "*Enkel*, meaning 'grandchild,' seems related to the older form *Ahnen*, meaning 'ancestors,' and to *akna* [read *ana*], the feminine form, which seems cognate with [Latin] *anus*, old woman." Here again the facts are put unclearly and rather misleadingly. *Enkel* "grandchild" is from Old High German *eninkilī*, *eninchilī*, a diminutive of *ano* "grandfather," *ana* "grandmother." The reciprocal use of "grandparent" for "grandchild" is seen also in Old Irish *aue* "grandson" (from Indo-Germanic \**awios*; cf. Latin *avus*, *avia*). *Ahne* (plural *Ahnen*) is the modern form of *ano* in its generalized significance. It is certainly not specifically connected with *ana*, which is merely the feminine correlate of *ano*. While it is true that Old High German *ano* and *ana* are cognate to Latin *anus*, it does not follow that *Enkel*, a quite secondary derivative of *ano*, bears a trace of matrilineal reckoning.

P. 426, l. 26: Wallis implies that *Geschwister* in the sense of "brothers and sisters" is old enough to bear on the problem of matrilineal reckoning. This is erroneous. The word is etymologically merely a collective plural of *Schwester*. In Old High German and Old Saxon *giswēster* still means "sisters," not yet "brothers and sisters." This *giswēster* is strictly parallel to a similarly formed Germanic word for "brothers": Old High German *gibrūoder*, Old Saxon *gibrōthar*, Anglo-Saxon *gebrōðor*. *Geschwister*, then, in its present meaning represents not a survival of an archaic method of reckoning descent, but a relatively late extension of its proper meaning.

P. 427, l. 1: German terms beginning with *Schwieger-* "-in-law" have nothing to do with *Schwester*. *Schwieger-* is a generalized term for relatives by affinity based on *Schwieger* "mother-in-law" (Old High German *swigar*) and *Schwäher* "father-in-law" (Old High German *swēhur*). Nor does *verschwiegert* primarily mean "besistered," as Wallis would have it, but "beparent-in-lawed"; its actual meaning is "related by marriage," not "related to." *Schwager* (Old High German *swāgur*) "brother-in-law" (originally "wife's brother") is a derivative from *Schwäher* and may be interpreted as "belonging to one's father-in-law, father-in-law's son" (cf. Sanskrit *śvāśura-* "belonging to one's father-in-law": *śvāśura-* "father-in-law"). All this has little enough to do with matrilineal reckoning.

P. 427, l. 33: Wallis's statement that "there is in early German no term for mother's brother" is not warranted by the facts. West-

Germanic \**auma-*, \**auhaima-*, "mother's brother," as we have seen, has even relatives, though not identical cognates, in non-Germanic languages. That \**auhaims* does not happen to occur in our Gothic records is probably due to accident.

P. 427, l. 36: Old High German *fatureo* (or *fetiro*) "father's brother" is not "from Latin *patruus*," but is merely cognate with it. Indeed, it is more closely related to Sanskrit *pitr̥ya-* than to Latin *patruus*. Old High German *fatureo* and Sanskrit *pitr̥ya-* point to Indo-Germanic \**patr̥wyo-*; Latin *patruus* and Greek *πάτρως* (contracted from *πάτρωνς*) to Indo-Germanic \**patr̥wo-*.

P. 428, l. 1: There is a curious inadvertence here. The term *snura* "daughter-in-law" could not be used by the wife, but only by her husband's parents. As far as *snura* is concerned, there is no point in saying that "no corresponding terms were used by the husband." It is different, of course, with *zeihhur* "husband's brother."

P. 428, l. 18: *Gesippt* is not "convivial," but "related by blood." It is formed from *Sippe* "sib, group of blood-kin."

P. 428, l. 22: I do not understand "the male descendants of *Enkeln*, father's brother." *Enkeln*, of course, means "grandchildren."

These are the corrections of detail that it seems necessary to make. I have left myself no room for a discussion of the larger points involved in Indo-Germanic kinship systems and their connection with social institutions and usages. The reflection of patrilineal reckoning in these systems is brought out fairly well by Wallis. On the other hand, much energy is fruitlessly expended in the attempt to demonstrate the existence of traces of an earlier matrilineal reckoning. It is a pity that Wallis did not take up more extensively the treatment of the one great process exemplified in the history of modern Indo-Germanic kinship systems (English, French, German). I refer to the tremendous simplification and systematization characterizing these systems, the two main elements in the process being the complete abolition of all distinction between agnates and cognates and the remodelling of the system of affinity in a manner strictly parallel to the system of consanguinity. These destructive and reformative changes have gone hand in hand with the development of new social and psychological points of view.

E. SAPIR

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF CANADA,  
OTTAWA, ONT.